

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1A, 1B, 2 and 3B. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1A, 1B, 2 and 3B, replace the original sheets including Figures 1A, 1B, 2 and 3B.

## REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the Specification and Drawings merely to overcome the rejections to the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The amendments are fully supported by the Specification and Drawings as filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for courtesy extended during the interview on November 15, 2007. An agreement was not reached.

## DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets," the Drawings have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions. Applicants therefore believe this objection to be overcome.

Further, Applicants have amended FIG. 3B so that the analog FM demodulator 198 is clearly differentiated from the analog FM demodulator 112 of FIG. 3A merely to overcome the rejection to the Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101, as further discussed below.

## REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 4, 7, 21 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the Examiner found the disclosed invention to be inoperative. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As best understood by Applicants, the Examiner found that the analog FM demodulator of FIG. 3A received digital signals, whereas the analog FM demodulator of FIG. 3B received analog signals. In response to this rejection, Applicants have amended FIG. 3B and Paragraph [0039] to distinguish the analog FM demodulator 122 from the analog FM demodulator 198.

An analog FM demodulator, as discussed in Paragraph [0030], is used to obtain a demodulated audio bitstream of an analog signal. Therefore, the analog FM demodulator 122 receives a digital output of an A/D converter 104 and demodulates the digital output to generate the demodulated audio bitstream. In contrast, the analog FM demodulator 198 receives outputs of the RF front end, which may be analog. However, the FM demodulator 198 may output a demodulated audio bitstream and thus may inherently include an A/D converter and demodulator or may instead merely process the analog signal in the analog domain.

Applicants therefore believe these rejections are overcome in view of the amendments to the Detailed Description and Drawings. Amendments to the Detailed Description and Drawings are fully supported by the Detailed Description and Drawings as filed, and therefore no new matter has been added.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 14-16, 18, 19 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tazaki (JP 2-154534). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, Tazaki does not at least show, teach or suggest a hybrid/all digital decoder that attempts to acquire synchronization while an analog FM demodulator simultaneously generates analog audio signals.

As best understood by Applicants, Tazaki includes a receiver that includes an analog demodulation device that receives analog signals in parallel with a digital demodulation device that receives digital signals. The digital demodulator **only** outputs processed digital signals **after** a synchronous detector detects synchronous signals within received signals. In other words, in Tazaki the analog demodulation device is halted when synchronous signals are detected, and then the digital demodulation device takes over and outputs processed digital signals.

In contrast, Claim 1 includes a hybrid/all digital decoder that simultaneously attempts to acquire synchronization while an analog FM demodulator generates analog audio signals. Unlike Tazaki, the hybrid/all digital decoder of Claim 1 does not wait until a synchronous signal is detected to attempt synchronization. Instead, **the hybrid/all digital decoder attempts to acquire synchronization simultaneously while the analog audio signals are being output.** Even if the digital demodulation device of Tazaki attempted to synchronize with received signals, which is not shown, taught or suggested, such attempt would only occur after the synchronization detector detected signals and the analog demodulation device was halted.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by one skilled in the field of the invention. Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech, Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be

inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

In Claim 1, hybrid/all digital signals and analog FM signals are received concurrently, but the hybrid/all digital signals take longer to synchronize. Therefore, the hybrid/all digital decoder attempts to synchronize while the analog FM demodulator is outputting demodulated signals. In Tazaki, an analog signal is processed or a digital signal is processed. Any synchronization of the digital signal of Tazaki occurs after analog signal processing is halted.

Therefore, Claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 14 and 18 are allowable for at least similar reasons as Claim 1. Claims 2-13, 15-17 and 19- 29 ultimately depend from Claims 1, 14 and 18 and are allowable for at least similar reasons.

#### **ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that claims 3, 6, 8-13, 17, 20, 23 and 25-29 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants reserve the right to rewrite Claims 3, 6, 8-13, 17, 20, 23 and 25-29 at a later date if needed.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 14, 2008

By:   
Michael D. Wiggins  
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

MDW/JHP